

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,006	06/26/2003	Surendra N. Naidoo	4017-3006	4938
30652	7590 12/16/2004		EXAMINER	
CONLEY R	•		POPE, DARYL C	
5700 GRANITE PARKWAY, SUITE 330 PLANO, TX 75024		330	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2632	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Comments		10/607,006	NAIDOO ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		DARYL C POPE	2632	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the cover sheet v	ith the correspondence address	
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	'ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of th period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOy statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	l		
2a) <u></u> □		This action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice up	•	•	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□	Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	thdrawn from consideration.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Ex- The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) [Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the of The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) objected to to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) <u>□</u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Elee the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in a e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachmen	t(s)			
1) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/5 r No(s)/Mail Date		s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/607,006 Page 2

Art Unit: 2632

DETAILED ACTION

ART REJECTION:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

- 2. Claims 1-7,12-15,23,30, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Faulkner et al(6,798,344).
- -- In considering **claims 1,3,5-7**, and **39** the claimed subject matter that is met by Faulkner et al(Faulkner) includes:
- 1) the base station is met by the secured locations(203) which generate alarm video corresponding to an alarm event(see: column 3, lines 18 et seq);

Application/Control Number: 10/607,006 Page 3

Art Unit: 2632

2) the central station is met by the central monitoring station(201) coupled through network 209 and receives substantially real time alarm video(see: column 3 lines 56-65).

- -- In considering claim **2,23**, and **30** the Internet is met by the Internet link of Faulkner(see: column 4, lines 51-58.
- -- In considering **claim 4**, the claimed one or more sensor units is met by the alarm sensor positioned in the secured location.
- -- In considering **claims 12-15**, the high speed network connection is met(see: column 3, lines 50-52.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 8-11,16-22,24-29, and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al(Faulkner).
- -- In considering **claim 8**, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a 360 degree camera, since this would have ensured the broadest possible coverage of the monitored area.
- -- In considering **claims 9-11**, the examiner takes Official notice, that in the video monitoring art, use of systems which begin intervals before an alarm event, end the interval after the alarm event, and as well utilize a predetermined interval duration is

Art Unit: 2632

well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate any of the above stated intervals into the system of Faulkner, since one of ordinary skill would have recognized the most optimal time interval for the system as desired.

- -- In considering **claims 16,31**, and **34**, since Faulkner already teaches transmitting signals sent from the secured locations(203) to remote stations(211-215), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to bypass the central station, since this would have helped reduce unnecessary signal traffic to the central station.
- -- In considering claims 17 and 32, the central station creation of the secure data connection after authenticating by the remote station is met by a valid password being necessary in order to access signals from the central station(see: column 4, lines 1-15).
- -- In considering **claims 18-22,33**, and **35-38**, upon authorization of the remote stations(211-215) of Faulkner, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the remote station to be operable to control activation, deactivation, and any other function of the base station as desired since this would have facilitated optimal response to the base station upon occurrence of events.
- -- In considering **claims 24**, it would have been obvious that the central station would have detected real time uncoupling from the base station, since the monitoring signal would have been real time, and therefore uncoupling would have been detected by a lost real time signal.

Page 5 Application/Control Number: 10/607,006

Art Unit: 2632

-- In considering claims 25-26, the examiner takes Official Notice that in the alarm

monitoring art, use of audio signals in conjunction with video signals is well known, and

therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate audio signals into the system of Faulkner, since this

would have provided another reliable means of verifying alarm events.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to DARYL C POPE whose telephone number is (571) 272-

2959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, DANIEL WU can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daryl C. Pope

DARYL C POPE

Primary Examiner

Dec. 12, 2004